arXiv:hep-th/9701119v1 23 Jan 1997

ETH-TH/96-53

On Zero–Mass Ground States in Super–Membrane Matrix Models

Jürg Fröhlich and Jens Hoppe[1]
Theoretical Physics
ETH-Hönggerberg
CH–8093 Zürich

Abstract We recall a formulation of super-membrane theory in terms of certain matrix models. These models are known to have a mass spectrum given by the positive half-axis. We show that, for the simplest such matrix model, a normalizable zero-mass ground state does not exist.

---

[1] Heisenberg Fellow
On leave of absence from Karlsruhe University

1 Introduction and Summary of Results

Some time ago [1], super-membranes in D space-time dimensions were related to supersymmetric matrix models where, in a Hamiltonian light-cone formulation, the $D-2$ transverse space coordinates appear as non-commuting matrices [2].

It has been proven in [3] that the mass spectrum of any one of these matrix models, which is given by the (energy) spectrum of some supersymmetric quantum-mechanical Hamilton operator [4], fills the positive half-axis of the real line. This property of the mass spectrum in super-membrane models is in contrast to the properties of mass spectra in bosonic membrane matrix models [2] which are purely discrete; see [5]. One of the important open questions concerning super-membrane matrix models is whether they have a normalizable zero-mass ground state. Such states would describe multiplets of zero-mass one-particle states, including the gravitation; (see [1]). A new interpretation of the mass spectrum of super-membrane matrix models (in terms of multi-membrane configurations) has been proposed in [6].

A first step towards answering the question of whether there are normalizable zero-mass ground states in super-membrane matrix models has been undertaken in [1]. In this note, we continue the line of thought described in [7] and show that, in the simplest matrix model, a normalizable zero-mass ground state does not exist.

Let us recall the definition of super-membrane matrix models. The configuration space of the bosonic degrees of freedom in such models consists of $D-2$ copies of the Lie-algebra of $SU(N)$, for some $N < \infty$, where D is the dimension of space-time, with $D = 4, 5, 7, 11$. A point in this configuration space is denoted by $X = (X_j)$ with

$$X_j \;=\; \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} X_j^A \, T_A, \; j = 1, \cdots, D-2, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\{T_A\}$ is a basis of $su(N)$, the Lie algebra of $SU(N)$. In order to describe the quantum-mechanical dynamics of these degrees of freedom, we make use of the Heisenberg algebra generated by the configuration space coordinates X_j^A and the canonically conjugate momenta P_j^A satisfying canonical commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} \left[X_j^A,\, X_k^B\right] \;&=\; \left[P_j^A,\, P_k^B\right] \;=\; 0, \\ \left[X_j^A,\, P_k^B\right] \;&=\; i\,\delta^{\,AB}\,\delta_{jk}\;. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

To describe the quantum dynamics of the fermionic degrees of freedom, we make use of the Clifford algebra with generators Θ_α^A, $A = 1, \cdots, N^2-1$, $\alpha = 1, \cdots, 2^{\left[\frac{D-2}{2}\right]}$, and commutation relations

$$\left\{\Theta_\alpha^A,\, \Theta_\beta^B\right\} \;=\; \delta_{\alpha\beta}\,\delta^{AB}\;. \tag{1.3}$$

The generators Θ^A_α can be expressed in terms of fermionic creation- and annihilation operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^A_{2\alpha-1} &= \frac{b^A_\alpha \; + \; c^A_\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} \;, \\ \Theta^A_{2\alpha} &= \frac{i \left(b^A_\alpha - c^A_\alpha \right)}{\sqrt{2}} \;, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

with $\left(b^A_\alpha \right)^* = c^A_\alpha, \;\; \alpha = 1, \cdots, \frac{1}{2}\, 2^{\left[\frac{D-2}{2}\right]},$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ b^A_\alpha, \; b^B_\beta \right\} &= \left\{ c^A_\alpha, \; c^B_\beta \right\} \;=\; 0, \\ \left\{ b^A_\alpha, \; c^B_\beta \right\} &= \delta_{\alpha\beta}\; \delta^{AB} \;. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

The Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}$, of state vectors (in the Schrödinger representation) is a direct sum of subspaces $\mathcal{H}_k, \;\; k = 0, \cdots, \;\; K := (N^2-1)\, \frac{1}{2}\, 2^{\left[\frac{D-2}{2}\right]}$. A vector $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_k$ is given by

$$\Psi \;=\; \sum_{k=0}^{K} \frac{1}{k!}\; b^{A_1}_{\alpha_1} \cdots b^{A_k}_{\alpha_k} \; \psi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}_{A_1 \cdots A_k}\, (X), \tag{1.6}$$

where $X = \left\{ X^A_j \right\}, \;\; j = 1, \cdots, D-2, \; A = 1, \cdots, N^2-1.$ We require that

$$c^A_\alpha \; \Psi \;=\; 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad \Psi \in \mathcal{H}_0 \;. \tag{1.7}$$

The scalar product of two vectors, Ψ and Φ, in $\mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$\langle \Psi, \Phi \rangle \;=\; \sum_{k=0}^{K} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k \\ A_1 \cdots A_k}} \int \prod_{j,A} dX^A_j \; \overline{\psi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}_{A_1 \cdots A_k}(X)} \;\times\; \phi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}_{A_1 \cdots A_k}(X). \tag{1.8}$$

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ carries unitary representations of the groups $SU(N)$ and $SO(D-2)$. Let $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ denote the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ carrying the trivial representation of $SU(N)$.

One can define supercharges, Q_α and $Q^\dagger_\alpha, \;\; \alpha = 1, \cdots, \frac{1}{2}\, 2^{\left[\frac{D-1}{2}\right]},$ with the properties that, on the subspace $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$,

$$\left\{ Q_\alpha, \; Q_\beta \right\} \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^{(0)}} \;=\; \left\{ Q^\dagger_\alpha, \; Q^\dagger_\beta \right\} \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^{(0)}} = 0 \;, \tag{1.9}$$

and

$$\left\{ Q_\alpha, \; Q^\dagger_\beta \right\} \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^{(0)}} \;=\; \delta_{\alpha\beta}\; H \Big|_{\mathcal{H}^{(0)}} \;, \tag{1.10}$$

where $H = M^2$, and M is the mass operator of the super-membrane matrix model.

Precise definitions of the supercharges and of the operator H can be found in [1] (formulas (4.7) through (4.12)). In [3] it is shown that the spectrum of $H \;|_{\mathcal{H}^{(0)}}$ consists of the positive half-axis $[0, \infty)$. The problem addressed in this note is to determine whether

O is an eigenvalue of H corresponding to a normalizable eigenvector $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$. Using eqs. (1.9) and (1.10), one can show that Ψ_0 must be a solution of the equations

$$Q_\alpha \Psi \;=\; Q_\alpha^\dagger \Psi = 0, \quad \text{for some } \alpha,\ \Psi \in \mathcal{H}^{(0)}\ . \tag{1.11}$$

If eqs. (1.11) have a solution, $\Psi_0 = \Psi_{\alpha_0}$, for $\alpha = \alpha_0$, they have a solution for all values of α, (by $SO(D-2)$ covariance). The problem to determine whether eqs. (1.11) have a solution, or not, can be understood as a problem about the cohomology groups determined by the supercharges Q_α. We define

$$\mathcal{H}_+ \;:=\; \bigoplus_{l\geq 0} \mathcal{H}_{2l}^{(0)}, \qquad \mathcal{H}_- \;:=\; \bigoplus_{l\geq 0} \mathcal{H}_{2l+1}^{(0)}\ .$$

We define the cohomology groups

$$H_{\sigma,\alpha} \;:=\; \left\{\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_\sigma^{(0)} \mid Q_\alpha\ \Psi = 0\right\}\ /\ \left\{\Psi \mid \Psi = Q_\alpha \Phi, \Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{-\sigma}^{(0)}\right\},$$

$\sigma = \pm 1$. If $H_{\sigma,\alpha}$ is non-trivial, for some σ and some α, then eqs. (1.11) have a solution.

2 The $(D = 4, N = 2)$ model

The goal of this note is a very modest one: We show that, for $D = 4$ and $N = 2$, eqs. (1.11) do not have any normalizable solutions. Our proof is not conceptual; it relies on explicit calculations and estimates and does therefore not extend to the general case in any straightforward way.

When $D = 4$ and $N = 2$ we use the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{q}_j \;&:=\; \left(X_j^1, X_j^2, X_j^3\right), \quad j = 1, 2, \\ \vec{\lambda} \;&=\; \left(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \lambda^3\right) \;:=\; \left(b_\alpha^1,\ b_\alpha^2,\ b_\alpha^3\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}} \;=\; \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^3}\right) \;:=\; \left(c_\alpha^1, c_\alpha^2, c_\alpha^3\right),$$

$\alpha = 1$. The operators representing the generators of $su(2)$ on $\mathcal{H}$ are given by

$$\vec{L} \;=\; -i\left(\vec{q}_1 \wedge \vec{\nabla}_1 + \vec{q}_2 \wedge \vec{\nabla}_2 + \vec{\lambda} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\right)\ . \tag{2.2}$$

The supercharges are given by (see [1], eq. (4.20))

$$\begin{aligned} Q \;&=\; \left(\vec{\nabla}_1 - i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}} \;+\; i\,\vec{q} \cdot \vec{\lambda}\,, \\ &\text{and} \\ Q^\dagger \;&=\; -\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 + i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right) \cdot \vec{\lambda} - i\,\vec{q} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\vec{q} \;=\; \vec{q}_1 \wedge \vec{q}_2 \;, \tag{2.4}$$

and $\wedge$ denotes the vector product. We then have that

$$Q^2 \;=\; (\vec{q}_1 - i\,\vec{q}_2)\;\cdot\;\vec{L}\;,\;\;(Q^\dagger)^2 \;=\; (\vec{q}_1 + i\,\vec{q}_2)\;\cdot\;\vec{L},$$

and

$$H \;=\; \left\{Q,\;Q^\dagger\right\}\;. \tag{2.5}$$

A vector $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi \;&=\; \psi + \frac{1}{2}\,\left(\vec{\lambda}\wedge\vec{\lambda}\right)\;\cdot\;\vec{\psi} \\ &=\; \psi + \frac{1}{2}\,\varepsilon_{ABC}\;\lambda^A\;\lambda^B\;\psi^C\;. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

For $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+^{(0)}$ (i.e., $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+$ with $\vec{L}\Psi = 0$), eqs. (1.11) imply the following system (*) of first-order differential equations:

$$i\,\vec{q}\,\psi \;=\; \left(\vec{\nabla}_1 - i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\wedge\vec{\psi}\;, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\vec{q}\;\cdot\;\vec{\psi} \;=\; 0\;, \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 + i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\;\psi \;=\; i\,\vec{q}\wedge\vec{\psi}\;, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 + i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\;\cdot\;\vec{\psi} \;=\; 0\;. \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, the equation $\vec{L}\Psi = 0$ yields

$$\left(\vec{q}_1\wedge\vec{\nabla}_1 + \vec{q}_2\wedge\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\;\psi \;=\; 0\;, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\left(\vec{q}_1\wedge\vec{\nabla}_1 + \vec{q}_2\wedge\vec{\nabla}_2\right)_A\;\psi_B\;+\sum_C\;\varepsilon_{ABC}\;\psi_c\;=\;0\;,\quad\forall\;A,B\;. \tag{2.12}$$

It is straightforward to verify that, for $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_-^{(0)}$, eqs. (1.11) imply a system of equation equivalent to (2.7) through (2.12). This can be interpreted as a consequence of Poincaré duality.

The formal expression for the Hamiltonian $H = \left\{Q, Q^\dagger\right\}$ is given by

$$H \;=\; H_B \;+\; H_F\;, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$H_B \;=\; -\,\vec{\nabla}_1^2 \;-\; \vec{\nabla}_2^2 \;+\; \vec{q}^{\,2}$$

and

$$H_F \;=\; (\vec{q}_1 + i\,\vec{q}_2)\;\cdot\;\left(\vec{\lambda}\wedge\vec{\lambda}\right) - (\vec{q}_1 - i\,\vec{q}_2)\cdot\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\vec{\lambda}}\wedge\frac{\partial}{\partial\vec{\lambda}}\right)\;. \tag{2.14}$$

As shown in [5], the spectrum of H_B is discrete, with

$$\text{inf spec } H_B \;=\; E_0 \;>\; 0\;. \tag{2.15}$$

The representation of the group $SO(D-2) \simeq U(1), (D=4)$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is generated by the operator

$$J \;=\; -\,i\,\left(\vec{q}_1\;\cdot\;\vec{\nabla}_2\;-\;\vec{q}_2\;\cdot\;\vec{\nabla}_1\right)\;-\;\frac{1}{2}\,\vec{\lambda}\;\cdot\;\frac{\partial}{\partial\vec{\lambda}}\;. \tag{2.16}$$

While J does not commute with Q or $Q^\dagger$, it does commute with $QQ^\dagger$ and $Q^\dagger Q$ and hence with H. It is therefore sufficient to look for solutions of eqs. (2.7) through (2.12) transforming under an irreducible representation of $U(1)$, i.e. solutions that are eigenvectors of J corresponding to eigenvalues $j \in \frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{Z}$. The spectrum of the restriction of J to the subspace $\mathcal{H}_+$ is the integers, while spec $\left(J\,|_{\mathcal{H}_-}\right)$ consists of half-integers.

3 Analysis of equations (*)

In this section, we assume that $Q\Psi = Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ has a solution $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+^{(0)}$ and then show that $\Psi = 0$.

The assumption that $Q\Psi = Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ implies that

$$\langle Q\Psi, Q\Psi\rangle + \langle Q^\dagger\Psi, Q^\dagger\Psi\rangle \;=\; 0\;. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $\xi := (\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^6$. Let $g_n(\xi) \equiv g_n(|\xi|)$, $n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots,$ be a function on $\mathbb{R}^6$ only depending on $|\xi| := \sqrt{\vec{q}_1^{\,2} + \vec{q}_2^{\,2}}$ with the properties that g_n is smooth, monotonic decreasing, $g_n(|\xi|) = 1$, for $|\xi| \le n$, $g_n(|\xi|) = 0$ for $|\xi| \ge 3n$, and $\left|\left(\frac{d}{dt}\,g_n\right)(t)\right| \;\le\; \frac{1}{n}$. Let $h_k(\xi)$, $k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots,$ be an approximate δ-function at $\xi = 0$ with the properties that h_k is smooth, $h_k \ge 0$, $\int h_k(\xi) d^6\xi = 1$, and

$$\text{supp } h_k \;\subseteq\; \left\{\xi\;\middle|\;|\xi|\;\le\;\frac{1}{k^2}\right\}\;. \tag{3.2}$$

We define a bounded operator, $R_{n,k}$, on $\mathcal{H}$ by setting

$$\left(R_{n,k}\Phi\right)(\xi) \;=\; g_n\left(\xi\right)\int h_k\left(\xi-\xi'\right)\Phi\left(\xi'\right)d^6\xi'\;, \tag{3.3}$$

for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$. Clearly

$$s - \lim_{\substack{n\to\infty\\k\to\infty}}\;R_{n,k}\,\Phi \;=\; \Phi\;, \tag{3.4}$$

for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$. Next, we note that, for a vector Φ in the domain of the operator Q,

$$\left(\left[Q, R_{n,k}\right] \Phi\right)(\xi) \;=\; I_{n,k}(\xi) \;+\; I\!I_{n,k}(\xi)\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$I_{n,k}(\xi) \;=\; \left(\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 - i\vec{\nabla}_2\right) g_n\right)(\xi) \cdot \int h_k\left(\xi - \xi'\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\, \Phi\left(\xi'\right) d^6\xi'\ , \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$I\!I_{n,k}(\xi) \;=\; i\, g_n(\xi) \int h_k\left(\xi - \xi'\right) \left(\vec{q}(\xi) - \vec{q}\left(\xi'\right)\right) \cdot \vec{\lambda}\Phi\left(\xi'\right) d^6\xi'\ . \tag{3.7}$$

The operator norm of the operators $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^A}$ and λ^A, $A = 1,2,3$, is bounded by 1. Since $\left|\frac{d}{dt}\, g_n(t)\right| \le \frac{1}{n}$, the operator norm of the multiplication operator $\left(\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 - i\vec{\nabla}_2\right) g_n\right)(\cdot)$ is bounded above by $\frac{1}{n}$. The operator norm of the convolution operator $\Phi(\xi) \mapsto \int h_n\left(\xi - \xi'\right) \Phi\left(\xi'\right) d^6\xi'$ is equal to 1. This implies

$$\left\|I_{n,k}\right\| \;\le\; \frac{6}{n} \left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\, \Phi\right\| \;\le\; \frac{18}{n}\, \|\Phi\|\ . \tag{3.8}$$

Next, we note that, for ξ in the support of the function g_n,

$$\left|h_k\left(\xi - \xi'\right) \left(\vec{q}(\xi) - \vec{q}\left(\xi'\right)\right)\right| \;\le\; \frac{7n}{k^2}\, h_k\left(\xi - \xi'\right)\ .$$

Thus, for $k \ge n$

$$\left\|I\!I_{n,k}\right\| \;\le\; \frac{21}{n}\, \|\Phi\|\ . \tag{3.9}$$

In conclusion

$$\left\|\left[Q, R_{n,k}\right]\ \Phi\right\| \;\le\; \frac{40}{n}\, \|\Phi\|\ , \tag{3.10}$$

for $k \ge n$.
A similar chain of arguments shows that, for Φ in the domain of $Q^\dagger$,

$$\left\|\left[Q^\dagger, R_{n,k}\right]\ \Phi\right\| \;\le\; \frac{40}{n}\, \|\Phi\|\ , \tag{3.11}$$

for $k \ge n$.

Next, we suppose that Ψ solves (3.1). We claim that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some finite $n(\varepsilon)$ such that, for $\Psi_{n,k} := R_{n,k}\Psi$,

$$\|\Psi\| \;\ge\; \left\|\Psi_{n,k}\right\| \;\ge\; (1 - \varepsilon)\, \|\Psi\|\ , \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\left\langle Q\Psi_{n,k}, Q\Psi_{n,k}\right\rangle \;+\; \left\langle Q^\dagger\Psi_{n,k}, Q^\dagger\Psi_{n,k}\right\rangle \;\le\; \varepsilon\|\Psi\|^2\ , \tag{3.13}$$

for all $k \ge n \ge n(\varepsilon)$. Inequality (3.12) follows directly from (3.4) and the fact that the operator norm of $R_{n,k}$ is $= 1$. To prove (3.13), we note that, for $k \ge n$,

$$\left\langle Q^\#\Psi_{n,k}, Q^\#\Psi_{n,k}\right\rangle \;=\; \left\langle \left[Q^\#, R_{n,k}\right]\Psi, \left[Q^\#, R_{n,k}\right]\Psi\right\rangle \;\le\; \left(\frac{40}{n}\right)^2\ \langle\Psi, \Psi\rangle\ , \tag{3.14}$$

where $Q^{\#} = Q$ or $Q^\dagger$. This follows from the equations $Q\Psi = Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ and inequalities (3.10) and (3.11).

We now observe that, by the definition of $R_{n,k}$, $\Psi_{n,k} = R_{n,k}\Psi$ is a smooth function of compact support in $\mathbb{R}^6$, for all $n \le k < \infty$. It therefore belongs to the domain of definition of the operators $Q\,Q^\dagger$ and $Q^\dagger\,Q$. Thus, for all $n \le k < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle Q\Psi_{n,k}, Q\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \;+\; \langle Q^\dagger\Psi_{n,k}, Q^\dagger\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \\ &\quad = \;\langle \Psi_{n,k}, \left\{Q, Q^\dagger\right\}\;\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \\ &\quad = \;\langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_B\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \;+\; \langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_F\Psi_{n,k}\rangle\;, \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where H_B and H_F are given in eq. (2.14), (and it is obvious from (2.14) that $\Psi_{n,k}$ belongs to the domains of definition of H_B and H_F).

As proven in [5],

$$\langle \Phi, H_B\Phi\rangle \;\ge\; E_0\|\Phi\|^2\;, \tag{3.16}$$

for some strictly positive constant E_0 (= inf spec H_B), for all vectors Φ in the domain of H_B. Thus, for $k \ge n \ge n(\varepsilon)$, and using (3.13), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon\,\|\Psi\|^2 \;&\ge\; \langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_B\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \;+\; \langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_F\Psi_{n,k}\rangle \\ &\ge\; (1-\varepsilon)^2\,E_0\|\Psi\|^2 \;+\; \langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_F\Psi_{n,k}\rangle\;. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Our next task is to analyze $\langle \Psi_{n,k}, H_F\Psi_{n,k}\rangle$. If $\Phi = (\varphi, \vec{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{H}_+$ belongs to the domain of definition of H_F then

$$\langle \Phi, H_F\Phi\rangle \;=\; 2\int \overline{\varphi\,(\xi)}\;\;(\vec{q}_1 - i\,\vec{q}_2)\cdot\vec{\varphi}\,(\xi)\;\,d^6\xi \;+\; c.c. \tag{3.18}$$

Note that $\Psi_n := \lim_{k\to\infty} \Psi_{n,k}$, where $\Psi_{n,k} = R_{n,k}\Psi$ and Ψ solves (3.1), belongs to the domain of definition of H_F. Since $\Psi = \left(\psi, \vec{\psi}\right)$ solves the equations $Q\Psi = Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$, see (3.1), we can use eqs. (2.8) and (2.9) to eliminate $\vec{\psi}$: For $\vec{q} \neq 0$, we find that

$$\vec{\psi}\,(\xi) \;=\; \frac{i\,\vec{q}}{q^2}\;\wedge\;\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 \;+\; i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\;\psi(\xi) \tag{3.19}$$

(recall that $\vec{q} = \vec{q}_1 \wedge \vec{q}_2$). Inserting (3.19) on the R.S. of (3.18), for $\Phi = \Psi_n$, we arrive at the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_n, H_F\Psi_n\rangle \;\;=\;\; 2\int &\overline{(g_n\psi)\,(\xi)}\,(\vec{q}_1 - i\,\vec{q}_2) \\ &\times\, g_n\,(\xi)\left(\frac{i\,\vec{q}}{q^2}\;\wedge\;\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 + i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\;\psi\right)(\xi)\;\,d^6\xi \;+\; c.c. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Let

$$T \;:=\; 2\,(\vec{q}_1 \;-\; i\,\vec{q}_2)\cdot\left(\frac{i\,\vec{q}}{q^2}\;\wedge\;\left(\vec{\nabla}_1 \;+\; i\,\vec{\nabla}_2\right)\right)\;.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Psi_n, H_F \Psi_n \rangle &= \langle \Psi_n,\, T\, \Psi_n \rangle \;+\; c.c. \\ &- \int |\, \overline{\psi\,(\xi)}\, |^2 \;\; g_n\,(\xi)\,[T, g_n]\,(\xi)\;\; d^6\xi \;+\; c.c.\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Next, we make use of the fact that Ψ must be SU(2)–invariant. This is expressed in eq. (2.11), which implies that $\psi(\xi)$ only depends on SU(2)–invariant combinations of the variables $\vec{q}_1$ and $\vec{q}_2$, i.e., on

$$r_1 \;:=\; |\vec{q}_1|,\;\; r_2 \;:=\; |\vec{q}_2|,\;\; x \;:=\; \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2}{r_1\, r_2}\;. \tag{3.22}$$

Instead, we may use variables q, p and φ defined by

$$p\, e^{i\varphi} \;:=\; \frac{1}{2}\;\left(\vec{q}_1 \;+\; i\,\vec{q}_2\right)^2 \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\;\left(r_1^2 \;-\; r_2^2\right) \;+\; i\, r_1 r_2\, x, \quad q \;:=\; |\vec{q}_1 \wedge \vec{q}_2| \tag{3.23}$$

with

$$0 \;\le\; p \;<\; \infty, \quad 0 \;\le\; \varphi \;<\; 4\pi, \quad 0 \;\le\; q \;<\; \infty\;. \tag{3.24}$$

If F is an SU(2)–invariant function then

$$\int d^6\xi\; F\;\;(\xi) \;=\; c \int_0^\infty dq \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi\; \frac{q\, p}{\sqrt{q^2 \;+\; p^2}}\; F\;\;(q, p, \varphi)\;\;, \tag{3.25}$$

where c is some positive constant.

If φ is SU(2)–invariant then

$$T\,\varphi \;=\; c'\; \frac{\sqrt{q^2 + p^2}}{q}\; \frac{\partial}{\partial\, q}\; \varphi\;, \tag{3.26}$$

where c' is a positive constant.

Using (3.26) in (3.21), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Psi_n, H_F \Psi_n \rangle \;&=\; c'' \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\infty dq\; p\; \frac{\partial}{\partial q}\; |\psi_n\,(q, p, \varphi)\,|^2 \\ &- c'' \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\infty dq\; p\; |\psi\,(q, p, \varphi)\,|^2\; \frac{\partial}{\partial q}\; \left(g_n \left(2\, \sqrt{q^2 + p^2}\right)^2 \right)\;\;,\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

with $c'' = c.c' \;>\; 0$.

By the definition of g_n,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q}\; \left(g_n \left(2\, \sqrt{q^2 + p^2}\right)^2 \right) \;\le\; 0\;,$$

pointwise. Therefore

$$\langle \Psi_n , H_F \Psi_n \rangle \ \geq \ - \, c'' \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \; p \, |\psi_n \, (q = 0, p, \varphi) \, |^2 \ . \tag{3.28}$$

In passing from (3.27) to (3.28), we have used that $\frac{\partial}{\partial q} |\psi_n \, (q, p, \varphi) \, |^2$ is an L^1–function with respect to the measure $p \; dp \; d\varphi \; dq$ and that

$$\int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \; p \, |\psi_n \, (q, p, \varphi) \, |^2$$

is right-continuous at $q = 0$. These facts will be proven below.

Combining eqs. (3.15), (3.17) and (3.28), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \| \Psi \|^2 \ &\geq \ \lim_{k \to \infty} \left\{ \langle Q \Psi_{n,k} , Q \Psi_{n,k} \rangle \ + \ \langle Q^\dagger \Psi_{n,k} , Q^\dagger \Psi_{n,k} \rangle \right\} \\ &\geq \ (1 - \varepsilon) \, E_0 \| \Psi \|^2 \\ &- \ c'' \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \; p \, |\psi_n \, (q = 0, p, \varphi) \, |^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

for all $n \ \geq \ n(\varepsilon)$. Choosing ε sufficiently small, we conclude that either $\Psi = 0$, or there is a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty dp \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \; p \, |\psi_n \, (q = 0, p, \varphi) \, |^2 \ \geq \ \beta \ , \tag{3.30}$$

for all sufficiently large n.

Next, we explore the consequences of (3.30). Since Ψ solves (3.1), we can use (3.19) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \infty \ > \ \| \Psi \|^2 \ &= \ \| \psi \|^2 \ + \ \| \vec{\psi} \|^2 \\ &= \ \int d^6 \xi \left\{ |\psi(\xi)|^2 \ + \ \frac{| \left(\vec{\nabla}_1 + i \, \vec{\nabla}_2 \right) \ \psi(\xi) |^2}{|\vec{q}|^2} \right\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Using that Ψ is SU(2)–invariant and passing to the variables q, p and φ, one finds that

$$2 \int_0^\infty dp \; p \int_0^\infty \frac{dq}{q} \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \left(\Big| \ \psi_{,p} \ + \frac{i \psi_{,\varphi}}{p} \ \Big|^2 \ + \ | \ \psi_{,q} \, |^2 \right) (q, p, \varphi) \ < \ \widetilde{K}, \tag{3.31}$$

where $\psi_{,x} := \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}$, and

$$\int_0^\infty dp \int_0^\infty dq \int_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \; \frac{pq}{\sqrt{p^2 + q^2}} \, |\psi \, (q, p, \varphi)|^2 \ < \ \widetilde{K}, \tag{3.32}$$

with $\widetilde{K} = \frac{\|\Psi\|^2}{c} < \infty$ (with the constant c appearing in (3.25)).

Inequalities (3.31) and (3.32) also hold for ψ_n, instead of ψ, with a constant K that is uniform in $n \to \infty$. These inequalities prove that $\frac{\partial}{\partial q} \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2$ is an L^1–function with respect to the measure $p\,dp\,d\varphi\,dq$ and that

$$f_n(q) \;:=\; \int\limits_0^\infty dp \int\limits_0^{4\pi} d\varphi\, p \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2$$

is right-continuous at $q = 0$, properties that were used in our derivation of (3.28).

By the Schwarz inequality and (3.31),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_0^\infty dp \int\limits_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \int\limits_0^\infty dq\; p \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2 \right| \\
&\leq\; 2 \left(\int\limits_0^\infty dp\, p \int\limits_0^\infty \frac{dq}{q} \int\limits_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \left|\psi_{n,q}\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \left(\int\limits_0^\infty dp\, p \int\limits_0^\infty q\,dq \int\limits_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \;\leq\; K' n^4,
\end{aligned}$$

for some finite constant K' !

To prove continuity of $f_n(q)$ in q, we note that, for $q_1 > q_2$,

$$\left| f_n\left(q_1\right) \;-\; f_n\left(q_2\right) \right| \;\leq\; \int\limits_0^\infty dp \int\limits_0^{4\pi} d\varphi \int\limits_{q_2}^{q_1} dq\; p \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2 \right|$$

with tends to 0, as $(q_1 - q_2) \to 0$, because $\frac{\partial}{\partial q} \left|\psi_n\left(q,p,\varphi\right)\right|^2$ is an L^1–function.

Next, we make use of the $SO(D-2) \simeq U(1)$ symmetry with generator J given in eq. (2.16). We have noted below (2.16) that J commutes with $QQ^\dagger$ and $Q^\dagger Q$, and hence that $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+$ can be chosen to be an eigenvector of J corresponding to some eigenvalue $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the variables q, p, φ,

$$J \;=\; -\,2\,i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\;.$$

Hence we may write

$$\psi\left(q,p,\varphi\right) \;=\; e^{i\,\frac{m}{2}\,\varphi}\; p^{\frac{m}{2}}\,\phi\left(q,p\right), \tag{3.33}$$

for some function ϕ independent of φ. Eqs. (3.31) and (3.32) then simply

$$\int\limits_0^\infty dp\, p^\alpha \int\limits_0^\infty \frac{dq}{q} \left(\left|\phi_{,p}\right|^2 + \left|\phi_{,q}\right|^2 \right)\left(q,p\right) < \infty \tag{3.34}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty dp \int_0^\infty dq \; \frac{p^\alpha q}{\sqrt{p^2+q^2}} \; |\phi\,(q,p)|^2 < \infty, \tag{3.35}$$

where $\alpha = m+1$. Furthermore, inequality (3.30), in the limit as $n \to \infty$, yields

$$\int_0^\infty dp\, p^\alpha \; |\phi\,(q=0,p)|^2 \;\geq\; \frac{\beta}{4\pi} \; . \tag{3.36}$$

Let $I_N := \left[\frac{1}{N}, N\right]$. Then inequality (3.34) implies that there exists a set $\Omega \subseteq [0,\infty)$ with the property that $\Omega \cap [0,\delta]$ has Lebesgue measures $\frac{\delta}{2}$, for any $\delta > 0$, and such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)^{|\alpha|} \int_{I_N} dp\, |\phi_{,p}\,(q,p)|^2 \;\leq\; K_\delta \tag{3.37}$$

for some constant K_δ independent of N and all $q \in \Omega \cap [0,\delta]$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\substack{q\to 0\\ q\in\Omega}} \int_{I_N} dp\, |\phi_{,p}\,(q,p)|^2 \;=\; 0, \tag{3.38}$$

for all N. It follows that, for $q \in \Omega \cap [0,\delta]\,,\; p_1, p_2 \in I_N,\; N < \infty$,

$$|\phi\,(q,p_1) - \phi\,(q,p_2)| \;=\; |p_1 - p_2| \left| \int_{p_1}^{p_2} \frac{dp}{|p_1-p_2|} \phi_{,p}\,(q,p) \right| \;\leq\; |p_1-p_2|^{1/2} \left(N^{|\alpha|} K_\delta\right)^{1/2}. \tag{3.39}$$

Thus, for $q \in \Omega \cap [0,\delta]$ and $p_1, p_2 \in I_N$, $\phi\,(q,p)$ is uniformly Hölder–continuous with exponent $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus $\phi_0(p) := \lim\limits_{\substack{q\to 0\\ q\in\Omega}} \phi(q,p)$ is uniformly continuous in $p \in I_N$, for all $N < \infty$, and it then follows from (3.38) that

$$\phi_0\,(p) \;=\; \phi_0 \;=\; \text{const.} \tag{3.40}$$

Inequality (3.36) then implies that $|\phi_0|$ must be positive! Without loss of generality, we may then assume that $\phi_0 > 0$.

Thus the function ϕ introduced in (3.33) has the following properties

$$(A) \quad \lim_{\substack{q\to 0\\ q\in\Omega}} \phi\,(q,p) \;=\; \phi_0 \;>\; 0$$

$$(B) \quad \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^\infty dq \; \frac{qp^\alpha}{\sqrt{p^2+q^2}} \; |\phi\,(q,p)|^2 \;<\; \infty$$

$$(C) \quad \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^\infty dq \; \frac{p^\alpha}{q} \; \left(|\phi_{,p}\,(q,p)|^2 + |\phi_{,q}\,(q,p)|^2\right) \;<\; \infty \; .$$

We now show that such a function $\phi\,(q,p)$ does not exist.

Let us first consider the case $\alpha \geq 0$. We choose an arbitrary, but fixed $p \in (0,\infty)$. Using the Schwarz inequality, we find that, for $0 < q_0 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{q_0} \frac{dq}{q}\, |\phi,_q(q,p)|^2 \;&\geq\; \frac{1}{q_0}\int_0^{q_0} dq\, |\phi,^q(q,p)|^2 \\ &\geq\; \left(\frac{1}{q_0}\int_0^{q_0} dq\, |\phi,_q(q,p)|\right)^2 \\ &\geq\; \left|\frac{1}{q_0}\int_0^{q^*(p)} dq\; \phi,_q(q,p)\right|^2 ,\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

where $q^*(p) \in [0, q_0]$ is the point at which $|\phi(q,p)|$ takes its minimum in the interval $[0, q_0]$. Note that $\phi(q,p)$ is continuous in $q \in [0, q_0]$, for almost every $p \in [0,\infty)$. The R.S. of (3.41) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{q_0^2}\;|\phi\,(q^*(p),p) - \phi_0|^2 \;.$$

Thus

$$\left(\frac{1}{q_0}\,|\chi\,(p) - \phi_0|\right)^2 \;\leq\; \int_0^{q_0} \frac{dq}{q}\,|\phi,_q(q,p)|^2 , \tag{3.42}$$

where $\chi(p) = \phi(q^*(p),p)$. By property (C),

$$\int_0^{\infty} dp\; p^{\alpha} \int_0^{q_0} \frac{dq}{q}\,|\phi,_q(q,p)|^2 \;\leq\; \varepsilon(q_0),$$

for some finite $\varepsilon(q_0)$, will $\varepsilon(q_0) \to 0$, as $q_0 \to 0$. Hence

$$\int_0^{\infty} dp\; p^{\alpha}\, |\chi(p) - \phi_0|^2 \;<\; q_0^2 \varepsilon\,(q_0)\,. \tag{3.43}$$

We define a subset $M_\delta \subseteq [0,\infty)$ by

$$M_\delta \;:=\; \left\{ p \;\middle|\; |\chi\,(p)| \;\leq\; \phi_0 - \delta \right\}.$$

Then

$$\int_{M_\delta} dp\; p^{\alpha} \;\leq\; \frac{1}{\delta^2}\int_0^{\infty} dp\; p^{\alpha}\,|\chi\,(p) - \phi_0|^2 \;<\; \frac{q_0^2\varepsilon\,(q_0)}{\delta^2}\;. \tag{3.44}$$

By property (B),

$$\begin{aligned}
\infty \;&>\; \int_0^\infty dp \int_0^\infty dq \frac{q p^\alpha}{\sqrt{p^2+q^2}} \left|\phi\left(q,p\right)\right|^2 \\
&\geq\; \int_0^\infty dp \int_{q_{0/2}}^{q_0} dq \frac{\frac{q_0}{2} p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \left|\phi\left(q,p\right)\right|^2 \\
&\geq\; \int_{M_\delta^c} dp \int_{q_{0/2}}^{q_0} dq \frac{\frac{q_0}{2} p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \left|\phi\left(q,p\right)\right|^2 \\
&\geq\; \frac{q_0^2}{4} \left(\phi_0 - \delta\right)^2 \int_{M_\delta^c} dp \frac{p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \;.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{M_\delta} dp \frac{p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \;+\; \int_{M_\delta^c} dp \frac{p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \;\leq\; \frac{1}{q_0} \int_{M_\delta} dp\, p^\alpha \;+\; \int_{M_\delta^c} dp \frac{p^\alpha}{p+q_0} \;<\; \infty \;.$$

This is a contradiction, since $M_\delta \cup M_\delta^c = [0,\infty)$, and $\int dp \frac{p^\alpha}{p+q_0}$ diverges.

Next, we consider the case $\alpha \leq -1$. We change variables, $k := \frac{1}{p}$,

$$dp \;=\; -\frac{1}{k^2}\, dk, \;\; \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \;=\; -\, k^2 \, \frac{\partial}{\partial k} \;.$$

Then conditions (A) – (C) take the form

$$(A') \quad \lim_{\substack{q \to 0 \\ q \in \Omega}} \; \phi\left(q,k\right) \;=\; \phi_0 \;>\; 0$$

$$(B') \quad \int_0^\infty dk \int_0^\infty dq \; \frac{q \; k^{\gamma-2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^2 + q^2}} \;\; \left|\phi\left(q,k\right)\right|^2 \;<\; \infty$$

$$(C') \quad \int_0^\infty dk \int_0^\infty dq \; \frac{k^{\gamma-2}}{q} \;\; \left(k^4 \left|\phi_{,k}\left(q,k\right)\right|^2 \;+\; \left|\phi_{,q}\left(q,k\right)\right|^2\right) \;<\; \infty,$$

where $\gamma := -\alpha > 0$.

Repeating the same arguments as above, we get again

$$\left(\frac{1}{q_0} \left|\chi\left(k\right) - \phi_0\right|\right)^2 \;\leq\; \int_0^\infty \frac{dq}{q} \left|\phi_{,q}\left(q,k\right)\right|^2, \tag{3.45}$$

where $\chi(k)$ is the value of $\phi(q,k)$ at the minimum of $|\phi(q,k)|$, for $q \in [0,q_0]$. By (C'),

$$\int_0^\infty dk \int_0^{q_0} dq \; \frac{k^{\gamma-2}}{q} \;\; \left|\phi_{,q}\left(q,k\right)\right|^2 \;<\; \varepsilon'\left(q_0\right) \;<\; \infty,$$

with $\varepsilon'(q_0) \to 0$, as $q_0 \to 0$. Hence

$$\int_0^\infty dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \left|\chi(k) - \phi_0\right|^2 \;\le\; q_0^2 \varepsilon'(q_0)\,. \tag{3.46}$$

Let $L_\delta \subseteq [0,\infty)$ be the set defined by

$$L_\delta \;:=\; \left\{ k \;\middle|\; |\chi(k)| \;\le\; \phi_0 - \delta \right\}.$$

Then we have that

$$\int_{L_\delta} dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \;\le\; \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_0^\infty dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \left|\chi(k) - \phi_0\right|^2 \;\le\; \frac{q_0^2 \varepsilon'(q_0)}{\delta^2}\;. \tag{3.47}$$

Condition (B') implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \infty \;&>\; \int_0^\infty dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \int_0^\infty \frac{q}{\frac{1}{k} + q} \left|\phi\left(q,k\right)\right|^2 \\ &\ge\; \int_0^\infty dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \int_{q_{0/2}}^{q_0} \frac{q_{0/2}}{\frac{1}{k} + q_0} \left|\phi\left(q,k\right)\right|^2 \\ &\ge\; \int_{L_\delta^c} dk\; k^{\gamma-1} \int_{q_{0/2}}^{q_0} \frac{q_{0/2}}{1 + k\, q_0} \left(\phi_0 - \delta\right)^2 \\ &\ge\; \left(\frac{q_0}{2}\right)^2 \left(\phi_0 - \delta\right)^2 \int_{L_\delta^c} dk\; \frac{k^{\gamma-1}}{1 + k\; q_0}\;. \end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

Combining (3.47) and (3.48) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{L_\delta} dk\; \frac{k^{\gamma-1}}{1 + k\; q_0} \;+\; \int_{L_\delta^c} dk\; \frac{k^{\gamma-1}}{1 + k\; q_0} \\ &\le\; \frac{1}{q_0} \int_{L_\delta} dk\; k^{\gamma-2} \;+\; \int_{L_\delta^c} dk\; \frac{k^{\gamma-1}}{1 + k\; q_0} \;<\; \infty\;. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, because $L_\delta \cup L_\delta^c = [0,\infty)$ and $\int dk\, \frac{k^{\gamma-1}}{1+k\; q_0}$ diverges for $\gamma \ge 1$.

This completes the proof that functions satisfying properties (A), (B) and (C) do not exist.

We have thus proven that eq.(3.1) only has the trivial solution $\Psi = 0$.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank H. Kalf for useful discussions.

References

[**1**] B. de Wit, J. Hoppe, H. Nicolai; Nuclear Physics B 305 [FS23] (1988) 545.

[**2**] J. Goldstone; unpublished.
J. Hoppe; MIT Ph.D. Thesis, 1982,
"Quantum Theory of a Relativistic Surface", in: "Constraint's Theory and Relativistic Dynamics" (eds. G. Longhi, L. Lusanna) Arcetri, Florence 1986, World Scientific.

[**3**] B. de Wit, M. Lüscher, H. Nicolai; Nuclear Physics B 320 (1989) 135.

[**4**] M. Baake, P. Reinicke, V. Rittenberg; Journal of Mathematical Physics 26 (1985) 1070.
R. Flume; Annals of Physics 164 (1985) 189.

[**5**] M. Lüscher; Nuclear Physics B 219 (1983) 233.
B. Simon; Annals of Physics 146 (1983) 209.

[**6**] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S.H. Shenker, L. Susskind; "*M* Theory as a Matrix Model: a Conjecture", hep-th/9610043.

[**7**] J. Hoppe; "On Zero-Mass Bound-States in Super-Membrane Models", hep-th/9609232.